DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 290 SO 019 758

AUTHOR Chen, Jeaw Mei; Lin, Phylis Lan
TITLE American College Students' Attitudes toward Rape Victims and Beliefs in a Just World.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; College Students; *Rape; Sex Bias; *Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes; Social Attitudes; Social Bias; Social Cognition; *Student Attitudes; *Victims of Crime
IDENTIFIERS Indiana; *Just World Scale (Rubin and Peplau); *Sex Role Stereotype Scale (Burt)

ABSTRACT

Two hundred sixty-six college students from four Indiana colleges and universities completed a series of surveys to determine gender differences in attitudes toward rape victims. The instruments adapted and used included the Rubin and Peplau Just World Scale (JWS), the Burt Sex Role Stereotype Scale, the Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (ATRVS) developed by Chinese college students in Taiwan, and an attrition scale. A literature review examines attitudes toward rape victims and rapists. Each survey instrument is then described, and the results are given by individual scale. A close look at the itemized JWS reveals that only three items showed significant gender differences and, overall, males believed in a "just" world. Significant gender differences appear on the SRSS with males more accepting of sex role stereotyping. The ATRVS indicated that females are more accepting of rape victims. Almost one-half (49.6%) of the students responding on the attrition scale believe that rape victims were "too trusting in people" as a major cause of rape, while one-fourth believe that behavior was another major cause. The instruments are also reviewed for correlations. Six tables and a 49-item bibliography are included. (DJC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305290

American College Students' Attitudes Toward Rape Victims and Beliefs in a Just World

Jeaw Mei Chen
National Chengchi University
Taipei, Taiwan

Phylis Lan Lin
University of Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JEAN M. CHEN
PHYLIS LAN LIN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

1988

* Direct all correspondence to Phylis Lan Lin, Department of Behavioral Sciences, University of Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Indiana 46227

Preparation of this paper was supported by University of Indianapolis Faculty Summer Research Grant. The authors are listed in alphabetical order.

30 819 758

American College Students'

Attitudes Toward Rape Victims and Beliefs in a Just World

According to the FBI, 87,340 rapes were reported in the United States in 1985. Since rapes are usually under-reported, the actual number is estimated to be at least five times higher (FBI, 1986). In recent years, the rates have risen so high that authorities have estimated a rape occurs in the U.S. once every 6 minutes. One in every ten women might be raped in her lifetime in the U.S. Although the age and attractiveness of rape victims are wide-ranging, rape is a problem shared by all females (Williams, 1984; Kilpatrick, et al. 1985; Kilpatrick, Veronen, and Best, 1984; Johnson, 1980; Koss, Gidycxz, and Wisniewsic, 1987).

There is some evidence that a person's attitudes toward women's rights and roles in society are related to one's views about rape (Weidener, 1984). Field (1978) found that people who view women in traditional roles are likely to blame rape victims. Weidner (1984) found that when individual differences were taken into account, negative attitudes toward women, belief in rape myths, and perceived target behavior (responsibility) were related to stigmatization of the rape victim. Attitudes toward rape victims have been shown to influence a jury. Brozan (1985) found that both male and female jurors treated more seriously the rape victim who seemed chaste or conventional in her style. Recent studies have pointed out that exposure to pornography affects attitudes toward rape victims (Malamuth and Check, 1981; Malamuth and Donnerstein, 1982; Check and Malamuth, 1983). Wyer, et al. (1985) in their experimental research also revealed that portrayals of women as sex objects increased male subjects' beliefs that the victim was responsible for the incident.

Many studies on the topic of rape have dealt with the rapist. Anger, aggressiveness, low self-esteem, lack of self-control, the tendency to be stimulated by abnormal sexual acts and nudity, and believing "rape myths" are some characteristics of rapists (Chen, 1986; Abel, et al., 1977; Atwood and Howell,

1976; Clark and Lewis, 1977; Williams and Holmes, 1981; and Scully and Marolla, 1985). Clark and Lewis (1977) found that rapists, more than the public at large, believe rape myths such as, "Women like to be raped," and "Women get pleasure from being raped." Gager and Schus (1976) also found that phrases rapists most often said to victims included, "It is what you've always wanted, isn't it?" and after the rape, "You really liked it, didn't you?" This distorted cognition leads to recidivism (Scully and Marolla, 1982). Burt's study (1980) supported the persistence of many misconceptions about rape and rapists. He found that almost three quarters of the people surveyed believed that women had an unconscious rape wish. As a result of this belief, people tended to hold the victim responsible for the rape.

Aside from studying characteristics of rapists, attribution studies were found to be important indicators in the whole process of stigmatizing victims. Jones and Aronsons's (1973) study of attitudes toward rape victims found that married women and virgins were considered to be more at fault than divorcees. It was based on the public's belief that a "respectable" person will not be raped unless the person misbehaves. This misconduct ultimately leads to rape, and therefore victims should be blamed.

A great deal of attributional processes are influenced by societal and cultural definitions (Seligmann, 1984; Russell, 1982; and L'Armand, Pepitone, and Shanmugam, 1981). Sandy (1981) examined the social-cultural context of rape in 156 societies and suggested that rape is part of a cultural configuration which includes interpersonal violence, male dominance, and sexual separation. Thus, one can predict that the higher the degree of sex-role stereotype, the higher the degree of victimization of rape victims.

Situational factors also affect the attribution of the causes of rapes. Calhoun et al. (1976) found that the more rape occurred in a given area, the less the victims were blamed. The public expects victims to struggle with their attackers.

If there were no signs of struggle, then victims were highly criticized (Krulewitz and Wash, 1979). Field (1978) found that "public officers" and the "public" agreed with the "rapists" that victims should take responsibility. The study further revealed that the "female counselors", being females, were the only ones who showed some acceptance of the victims. In conclusion, attribution studies found a very large tendency for victims to be blamed by the public. The "blaming of the victim" provides a justification for the oppression of society's victims. If people themselves are responsible for the fact that they are sick, poor, disabled, or raped, there is little need for the rest of us to sympathize withthem (Ryan, 1971; Howard, 1984; Chen and Tu, 1984; Ratliff, Chen and Lin, 1988). The consequences of blaming victims are quite clear. They inevitably lead victims to self-blame and fear of filing reports. Victims were often trapped in both "behavioral" and "characteristic" blame. Self-blame and other blame further stigmatized victims and greatly hindered their coping and adjusting mechanisms (Chen and Lin, 1987; Janoff-Bullman, 1979; Miller and Porter, 1983).

What contributes to the public's attitudes toward rape victims? In addition to the sex-role stereotype, Lerner's (1970 & 1980) "just world" hypothesis might provide an explanation. Lerner (1965) ran several laboratory experiments in which victims were picked at random to be given electric shock. It was found that subjects tended to denigrate them, as if the victims were morally responsible for their misfortunes. Lerner interprets that we all believe in a just world. Good things happen to good people, while bad things happen to bad people. If something bad happens to someone, he or she has to be a bad person. People believe in a just world mainly because they want to believe that the world is controllable and predictable rather than uncontrollable and unpredictable. Thus, bad things won't happen to a good person like me, and the victim himself/herself is responsible. Janoff-Bulman and Frieze (1983) used the term "illusion of invulnerability" to describe the notion that prior to victimization, most of us think that "it can't

happen to me." Langer (1975) found that even in the case of pure chance, people tended to believe that they were able to control the situation. Based on this assumption of the "illusion of control," the public tended to accuse victims for not trying to control the situation. To protect this sense of control, we blame people (victims) for the bad things that happen to them. Therefore, the world is just.

The beliefs in a just world have led victims to believe that they were bad girls because they were raped (Burt, 1980; Field, 1978; Brownmill, 1975; Hurt, 1977; and Thornton, 1984).

The present study was designed to investigate how college students' beliefs in a just world and sex-role stereotyping are related to their attribution of responsibility in rape cases and their attitudes toward rape victims. This study was derived from an original study, by the present researchers, in Taiwan in 1985 (Chen and Lin, 1987). In that study, both public and college samples were drawn. For both studies, comparing gender differences in attitudes toward rape victims and beliefs in a just world seems to be a logical cross-sectional research design. Therefore, the focus of the present research was also placed upon the comparative study on gender differences. A third research report was prepared separately. The focus, then, was on a cross-cultural comparative study. The key purposes of the present study were to:

1. Understand the college students' views of a "just world" and their acceptance of sex-role stereotyping.

2. Understand the college students' attitudes toward rape victims and their views on the important factors which triggered the rape incidents.

3. Understand how an individual's attitudes toward rape victims are related to his/her belief in a just world, acceptance of sex-role stereotypes, and views on factors attributing to rape incidents, and

4. Understand whether gender might be related to these attitudes.

Methodology

Subjects

Two hundred and sixty-six college students from four universities and colleges in Indiana (both public and private) answered the survey questionnaire in 1987. The sample included 101 (38.3.%) male and 163 (61.3%) female respondents (2 missing data). The majority (55.5%) were ages 10 to 19, and 33.2% of the respondents were in the 20 to 29 category. The majority of the respondents (53.4%) were Protestant with the category of "other" coming in second (25.8%) and "Catholic" coming in third (20.1%). Most of the students were majoring in the arts and sciences (42.5%), education (23.9%) and business (19.5%). Nearly three quarters of the respondents were freshmen and sophomores (34.6% and 38.2%, respectively). A little over three-quarters of the students (79.4%) were also single. Seventy-nine (31.6%) respondents knew a rape victim at the time of the survey. However, 188 (79.9%) of them were thinking about what happened to the victim while answering the questionnaire.

Instruments and Analysis

The design of the research instruments is described by the following: The Just World Scale (JWS). The JWS was originally designed by Rubin and Peplau (1975) and was tested by Rubin at Boston University and Oklahoma University. The internal consistencies (KR-20) were 0.80 and 0.81, and several pilot studies proved to have high scale reliability. Ma and Smith (1985) modified and translated the JWS to the Chinese language and then tested it on 1091 students at two universities in Taiwan. The original JWS has 20 items (Items 1-20), 9 being "unjust" and 11 being "just" items. The present study used a 23-item scale with 10 "unjust" and 13 "just" items. The results also revealed high validity, and the between-item reliability was high. For the purpose of a future cross-cultural analysis, the Chinese translation of the JWS for the present study was tested on 233 students in Taiwan

in 1985. The JWS for the present survey was back translated independently from the Chinese scale for accuracy. Although some of the wordings are slightly different from those in the original JWS (Rubin's & Peplau's), the double back translations (from English to Chinese to English to Chinese to English) prove to be adherent to the original scale. The following "Just World Scale" identifies the labels for "just " and "unjust" measures and their domains.

Statement	Label	Domain
1. I feel that many people in the world have a false reputation.	(U)	(general)
2. In general, this is a fair world.	(J)	(general)
3. Luck always brings fortune.	(J)	(general)
4. Those who drive carefully and those who drive without care have the same probability of being hurt in a car accident.	(U)	(traffic)
5. Many criminals are judged innocent in court.	(U)	(criminal justice)
6. If you study hard, you will receive good grades.	(J)	(school)
7. If you take care of your health you are very unlikely to have a heart attack.	(J)	(health)
8. Those candidates who insist on holding onto their principles in an election are usually the losers.	(U)	(politics)
9. Innocent people are seldom put in jail.	(J)	(criminal justice)
10. In a race, many athletes are not caught when they violate a regulation.	(U)	(sport)
11. A person will get what he (or she) deserves.	(J)	(general)
12. Parents always find good excuses to punish their children.	(J)	(family-parenting)

13.	Those who do good deeds are usually not known and do not receive just rewards.	(U)	(general)
14.	Although bad persons might have held the power in the history of mankind, good persons will eventually regain control.	(J)	(politics)
15.	In all occupations, those who work hard always get promoted.	(J)	(work)
16.	Parents often neglect their children's wishes.	(U)	(family-parenting)
17.	In our court system, it is difficult to find a fair judge.	(U)	(criminal justice)
18.	One should blame himself (or herself) for his (or her) misfortunes.	(J)	(general)
19.	Criminals always pay for their actions.	(J)	(criminal justice)
20.	Innocent people are always the victims.	(U)	(criminal justice)
21.	The rich should be heavily taxed.	(J)	(wealth)
22.	Most people do not have the motivation to cheat.	(U)	(general)
23.	In a disordered world, criminals should be severely punished.	(J)	(criminal justice)

A seven-point Likert scale was used ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with scores ranging from 1 to 7. (Note: the original Rubin and Peplau's JWS used a 6-point scale.) For the positive items ("just"), the higher the score, the more the subject disagrees with the statement; for the negative items ("unjust"), the higher the score, the higher the degree of agreement. These items were recoded. Therefore, the higher the score, the lower the degree of belief in a "just world."

In order to understand the dimensions of the JWS, a Principle Factor Analysis was done on the scores of each item. By using varimax method, two factors (with Eigenvalue > 1) were derived from the analysis. Factor 1, "Unjust Factor," (factor

loading > 0.36) contained 4 items clustered around the idea of an unjust world. Factor 2, "Just Factor," (factor loading > 0.43) was composed of 3 items which seemed to be associated with the idea of a just world (Table 1). The correlation between these two factors and other measurements allows researchers to further understand the relation between the belief in a just world and the attitudes toward rape victims.

Sex Role Stereotype Scale (SRSS)

The SRSS, designed by Burt (1980), is aimed at measuring an individual's acceptance of sex-role stereotypes. The scale included 9 items, and its Cronbach Alpha Coefficient was 0.80 (Burt, 1980). The scale reliability was tested by Check & Malamuth (1983) and was found to be highly correlated (r=-.73) with Spence & Helmreich's (1972) sex-role stereotype scale. The scale, including 7 positive and 2 negative items, was measured by the Likert method with the higher the score, the lower the sex-role stereotype.

Factor analysis was conducted from the results of the present study. Eight items were found to have a factor loading larger than 0.42, and those items were all related to "traditional female behaviors." Therefore, the dimension was termed "traditional female" factor (Table 2).

Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (ATRVS)

The items in the scale used in the present study were first generated by senior psychology majors at the National Cheng-Chi Universtiy. Several items from Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and Field's (1978) Attitudes Toward Rape Incidence Scale were added. A 50-item scale was then tested on 100 students. After the item analysis, 29 items with low discriminatory power were deleted. A 21-item scale was then used in the present study, including the item "I am willing to accept a rape victim as my girl friend," which was applied to male subjects only. Reverse scoring was applied to the 6 negatively worded items. The higher the total score, the higher the degree of acceptance of rape victims (Chen & Lin,

1987).

Factor analysis revealed three key factors (with factor loading > 0.41) on the scale. The first factor, "characteristics of the rape victim" factor, includes 5 items which are related to whether or not subjects judged the nature of the rape incident based on the victims' characteristics. The second factor, "victimization" factor, includes 4 items which are related to victimization or stigmatizing the victim theme. The third factor, "blaming the victim" factor, includes 4 items which are focused on the negative evaluation of the victim's behavior. These three factors (dimensions) allow researchers to correlate subjects' acceptance of rape victims and their beliefs in a just world (Table 3).

Attribution Scale (AS)

The attribution scale used in the present research was divided into two sections. Section one listed four possible causal factors (characteristics of rapists, characteristics of victims, circumstances, and luck) which led to rape incidents. A 7-point Likert scale was used for subjects to indicate their viewpoints. Section two identified a list of ten characteristics of victims which might lead to rape incidents. Items (overexposure of outfits, failing to fight back or struggle, not knowing how to behave themselves properly, etc.) which entailed victims' misbehaviors, personalities or characteristics, and cause-effect consequences, etc. were evaluated by subjects. The "other" item was provided for subjects to further elaborate on attribution factors.

Subjects were asked to consider the characteristics and behaviors of the rape victim and to identify major factors which caused rape. Since it is a multiple choice check list, factor analysis was not applied. Nevertheless, the frequency counts would allow researchers to draw some interesting conclusions for further elaboration on subjects' attitudes toward rape victims.

Social-demographic Information

Eight items were included in the basic information section: sex, age,

education, religion, occupation, marital status, whether a victim is an acquaintance of the subject, and whether the subject thought of the victim at the time of answering the questionnaire. For the purpose of this preliminary report, the interaction effects between sex and other demographic variables were not analyzed.

Results

Beliefs in a "Just World"

The total mean score from the JWS and the two dimensions explains an individual's belief in a just world--the higher the score, the lower the degree of acceptance of the "just world" idea. Results from the present study showed a mean of 3.98, which reflected the subjects' slight rejection of the "just world"; this was in congruence with Wagstaff's study of the JWS with British subjects (1983).

A closer look at the itemized JWS revealed that only three items showed significant gender differences. Two (item 17 and item 20) of these items were related to the "just" idea and one (item 4) was "unjust". However, the total mean scores for the JWS showed a significant gender difference (mean = 3.91 for male and 4.04 for female; $t = -.26$, $p = .008$). The data revealed that males, more than females, believed in a "just world". The finding (gender difference) does not support previous studies (Rubin and Peplau, 1975; Wagstaff, 1983) of the negligible relationship between JWS and sex.

However, educational background, marital status and whether the subjects knew any rape victims or not did not show any significant differences in the JWS and the two subscales.

A significant gender difference was found on the "unjust" factor mean scores ($t = -2.25$, $p = .02$). (Table 1) The study also found subjects tended to reject items related to the "criminal justice" theme (items 5, 9, 17, 19, 20, and 23). It is interesting to point out that both sexes tended to disagree regarding the work related statement, "In all occupations, those who work hard always get promoted."

Sex Role Stereotype

Significant differences between the sexes were shown on the SRSS. For instance, males, more than females, accepted the statement, "It is wrong for a woman to remain single." ($t = -2.71$, $p = 0.007$). However, there was no significant gender difference with regards to the statement: "It is wrong for a woman not to have a family (to be childless)." This finding reflects some very intriguing attitudes toward marriage and the family. Although there was no gender difference toward a childless woman, the mean scores from this item (5.683 for males and 5.98 for females) were higher than the means for the statement regarding a woman remaining single (5.465 for males and 5.853 for females). This meant, for both sexes that to be childless was more acceptable than to remain single.

A look at the total scores from the SRS scale showed that mean scores for both sexes were over 4 (mean = 4.879 for males and 5.515 for females). This reflected that males accepted sex-role stereotyping more than females ($t = -2.67$, $p = 0.005$). Nevertheless, both sexes disagreed with statements reflecting sex-role stereotypes. Since only one dimension ("traditional females") was derived from the factor analysis, it is adequate to conclude that males, more than females, consider that "females should abide with traditional female roles." This conclusion was drawn based upon the consistency of th lower scores for males in both the "traditional female dimension" score and the SRSS total score (Table 2).

There are significant differences between the sexes in items #3, #4, #8, and #9 (Table 2). In each of those questions, males tend to accept the traditional female role more than females do. Even though the items are not significant, it is interesting to note that females, more than males, tend to accept the traditional female role on questions #2 and #7. In question #2, "A girl must be a virgin when she gets married," the mean for males is 5.267 and for females is 4.993, and in question #7, "There is nothing wrong with a single girls going to a bar," the males' mean is 5.220 and the females' mean is 5.190.

Attitudes Toward Rape Victims

By tabulating the total score from the ATRVS, it was found that both males and females tended to accept rape victims (The mean for males was 5.65 and for females was 6.02), although females had a higher degree of acceptance of victimes than did males ($t = -4.55$, $p < 0.001$). In addition, separate scores from three dimensions--"characteristics of the rape victime," "victimization," and "victim's behavior," revealed that females had higher means than males ($t = -3.84$, $p < 0.001$; $t = -2.81$, $p < 0.01$; and $t = -4.66$, $p < 0.001$). This further confirmed the finding that females, more than males, had a higher degree of acceptance of rape victimes. Furthermore, females also had higher scores on every single item in the three dimensions. This leads one to conclude that males are more reluctant to accept rape victims (Table 3).

Attribution Factors

The result showed, on a 7-point scale, that the mean scores for characteristics of rapists, victims, circumstances, an luck factors were 2.06, 4.02, 2.69, and 4.12, respectively. Of these, rapists and circumstances were considered to be more important factors than the other two. Among the four factors, only attribution to victim characteristics showed a significant gender difference ($t = -3.17$, $p < 0.01$).

Males, more than females, attribute the characteristics of the victime as an important cause of rape. The more one believes that rape is the victim's fault, the more one tends to blame the victim, and the more the victim is stigmatized. The characteristics of the rapist had the lowest mean (1.940 for males and 2.181) for females) which revealed it as the most important cause of rape.

Subjects were further asked to indicate major attribution factors from a list of the characteristics of rape victims. Almost half (49.6%) of the subjects considered "too trusting in people" as a major cause of rape. Only 2.6% and 1.5% considered "retribution" ("one inevitably reaps what he sows") and "a problem of

her ancestry" as major factors. About a quarter of the subjects also considered behavior related characteristics as a major cause, i.e. "exposes too much by wearing revealing clothing." Table 4 shows in rank order the frequencies of the responses. Table 5 summarizes mean difference tests for gender's attitudes toward rape victims, attribution of causality, belief in a just world, and other variables.

Correlations Among the Four Scales

A second order analysis was carried out for further understanding of the relationships between and among the four scales used in the present study. A number of significant correlations were found. They are briefly described as follows:

1. The correlation between the JWS and the other scales

a. No significant correlation between the JWS and the SRSS was found.

b. However, a positive correlation between the JWS and the Victim's Behavior factor was found ($r = .10$, $p < .05$); the more one believed in a just world, the more one blamed the victim's behavior and circumstances.

The JWS and the Attribution Factor (circumstances under which rape occured) were also positively correlated ($r = 0.13$, $p < 0.5$). It was also found that the unjust factor was positively correlated with the Characteristic of the Victim factor ($r = 0.15$, $p < 0.001$).

2. The correlation between the SRSS and other scales

SRSS was significantly correlated with the jAS, the three dimensions of the AS, and the Characteristics of the Victim Attribution at $p < 0.001$ level ($r = .57$, $.38$, $.44$, $.40$, and $.27$, respectively). In short, the more one accepted the SRSS, the more one tended to blame victimes.

3. ATRVS and AS

Data showed that the higher the scores sunjects received on the ATRVS, the lower their scores on one of the Attribution factors. Namely, the more one rejected rape victims, the less one attributed the incidence to the characteristics of the rapist ($r = -.29$, $p < 0.001$). The Blaming the Victim factor and the Characteristics of the Victim factor were also found to be positively correlated with every scale except the characteristic of rapist attribution. In other words, the more one blamed the victim, the more one accepted the sex-role stereotype and the less one attributed the responsibility to the rapist (Table 6).

Discussions and Conclusions

The purposes of the present study were to assess whether there were gender differences in attitudes (acceptance of) toward rape victims and to determine these attitudes' correlations with one's beliefs in a just world. Significant gender differences were found. Although females had a higher degree of acceptance of victims than did males, mean scores from the Attitudes Toward Rape Victim Scale indicated that both sexes, in general, tended to accept rape victims. In addition, although males accepted sex-role stereotypes more than did females, the findings suggested that both sexes tended to reject sex-role stereotypes. This finding was inconsistent with the study on Taiwan subjects (Chen and Lin, 1987). Although both studies showed significant gender differences, the U.S. subjects far more rejected the attitudes toward sex-role stereotypes. This was predictable since the Chinese society tends to be more male-dominant.

Behaviors tended to be influenced by attitudes. Although subjects attributed rape incidents least to the characteristics of victims and most to the rapists, the present study found that the more one accepted the sex-role stereotypes, the more one tended to blame victims and the less one attributed the responsibility to the rapist. This finding supports a previous study by Howard (1980).

It is interesting to point out that on the SRSS male subjects felt very strongly that "when a man's girlfriend gets insulted, he should fight back" ($t = -2.78$, $p < 0.001$). This might reflect the traditional idea that rape is not only an act of violence toward the woman but also a sign of violence toward the woman's man.

The results showed that the more one believed in a just world, the more one blamed the victim's behavior and circumstances. Gender appeared to be an important variable in affecting attitudes toward rape victims, identifying attribution factors, affecting the degree of belief in a "just world," and accepting sex-role stereotypes. Males, significantly more than females, believed in a "just world"

idea and accepted the sex-role stereotypes. One unfortunate consequence of the tendency to see the world as a just place is that it provides a justification for blaming the victims.

Although gender differences are given substantial support by the obtained data, the findings from the present study are not in accord with the previous studies (Ma and Smith, 1985 and Zubin and Peplau, 1973) regarding gender differences in beliefs in a just world. Nevertheless, the present study supports many studies on attitudes toward rape victims; more specifically, attributions of blame to rape victims may be influenced in part by one's acceptance of sex-role stereotypes and rape myths (Wyer, et al., 1985; Sattlem, et al., 1984; Acock and Irland, 1983; L'Armand, et al., 1981; and Burth, 1980). Many items on the ATRVS in the present study were related to rape myths. The findings also pointed to the fact that rape myths abound among college students. These myths formed a part of an interrelated attitude structure, as shown in the present study, that includes acceptance of traditional sex-role stereotyping and beliefs in a just world.

It is important to point out that the study also found subjects tended to reject items related to the "criminal justice" theme. The results might imply that an alarming increase in numbers of rapes occurred every year; yet many assailants were not convicted.

A close look at the Pearson Correlation Matrix (Table 6) reveals that almost all scales and subscales are significantly correlated. The findings support the assertion that attitudes (beliefs in a just world, attitudes toward rape victims and sex-role stereotyping) and behaviors (blaming the victim and victimization) are indeed intertwined. A further analysis on the causal relations between attitudes and behaviors should be considered.

Subjects in the present study, as compared to subjects in Taiwan, tended to reject sex-role stereotypes, just world beliefs and rape myths. At the same time, it needs to be pointed out that the present samples were college students in the

Midwest; therefore, the generalization of the conclusion should be limited to this particular group. It is suggested that further research should focus on sex-role socialization practices and their impacts on changing attitudes toward rape victims. If a college sample were used again, a comparison of their attitudes toward date rape, marital rape and other kinds of forcible rapes might be points of interest.

Table 1 Gender and the Means for the JWS, Unjust Factor, and Just Factor

Just World Scale	male		female		pooled variance estimate	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	t	p
1. I feel that many people in the the world have a false reputation.	4.76	1.32	5.01	1.20	-1.58	ns
2. In general, this is a fair world.	4.13	1.35	4.30	1.28	-0.99	ns
3. Luck always brings fortune.	3.00	1.14	3.20	0.94	-1.56	ns
4. Those who drive carefully and those who drive without care have the same probability of being hurt in a car accident.	3.14	1.72	3.58	0.68	-2.02	*
5. Many criminals are judged innocent in court.	4.59	1.34	4.74	0.12	-0.97	ns
6. If you study hard, you will receive good grades.	3.20	1.41	3.29	0.39	-0.48	ns
7. If you take care of your health, you are very unlikely to have a heart attack.	3.55	1.41	3.65	0.13	-0.66	ns
8. Those candidates who insist on holding onto their principles in an election are usually the losers.	3.71	1.26	3.67	0.03	0.25	ns
9. Innocent people are seldom put into jail.	4.00	1.40	4.24	0.19	-1.43	ns
10. In a race, many athletes are not caught when they violate a regulation.	3.96	1.29	4.09	0.04	-0.95	ns
11. A person will get what he (or she) deserves.	3.68	1.34	3.98	0.43	-1.73	ns
12. Parents always find good excuses to punish their children.	4.77	1.05	4.75	0.06	0.12	ns
13. Those who do good deeds are usually not known and do not receive just rewards.	3.84	1.26	3.81	0.25	0.19	ns
14. Although bad persons might have held the power in the history of mankind, good persons will eventually regain control.	3.73	1.21	3.67	0.08	0.40	ns

Table 1 continued

15. In all occupations, those who work hard always get promoted.	4.79	1.10	4.85	1.02	-0.51	ns
16. Parents often neglect their children's wishes.	3.83	1.26	3.72	1.14	0.76	ns
17. In our court system, it is difficult to find a fair judge.	3.09	1.21	3.45	1.08	-2.46	**
18. One should blame himself (or herself) for his (or her) misfortunes.	4.10	1.35	4.29	0.27	-1.12	ns
19. Criminals always pay for their actions.	5.01	1.24	4.99	1.32	0.16	ns
20. Innocent people are always the victims.	3.14	1.04	3.56	1.07	-3.15	***
21. The rich should be heavily taxed.	4.13	1.59	4.05	1.24	0.48	ns
22. Most people do not have the motivation to cheat.	4.81	1.19	4.75	1.17	0.38	ns
23. In a disordered world, criminals should be severely punished.	4.75	1.17	3.36	1.19	-1.23	ns
Total JWS	3.91	1.27	4.04	0.37	-2.67	**
Unjust Factor	4.14		4.37		-2.25	*
Just Factor	4.15		4.21		-0.56	ns

*p<.05; **p<.01; and ***p<.001

Unjust factor includes items 1,2,5, and 17.
Just factor includes items 11,14, and 19.

Table 2 Sex-Role Stereotype Scale and the "Traditional Female Role" Factor mean Scores

"Traditional Female Role" Factor	Male		Female		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
2. A girl must be a virgin when she gets married.	5.26		4.99		1.45	ns
3. It is wrong for a woman to remain single.	5.68		5.98		-2.11	ns
4. In public places, a wife should not refute her husband.	4.59		5.26		-3.36	**
6. It is much worse for a woman to get drunk than for a man to do so.	5.27		5.50		-1.28	ns
7. There is nothing wrong with a single girl going to a bar.	5.22		5.19		0.17	ns
8. When a girl wants to obtain something, it is much better for her to use her attraction than to use ability.	5.38		6.15		-5.18	**
9. When a man's girlfriend gets insulted, he should fight back.	3.63		4.15		-2.78	***
Total (Traditional Female Role Factor)	5.07		5.38		-3.05	**
SRSS	4.87		5.15		-2.86	**

*p<.05; **p<.001 and ***p=000

Table 3 Mean Scores for Attitudes Towards Rape Victims by Gender

ATRVS	Male	Female	t	p
"Victimization" Factor				
1. Rape victims should be responsible for what happened.	6.01	6.47	-3.09	**
2. Rape victims also should be punished.	6.22	6.71	-3.56	***
4. We should feel sympathy for the rape victim.	5.63	5.85	-1.34	ns
7. A woman is not virtuous when she gets raped.	6.12	6.49	-3.84	***
Subscale Total	6.12	6.49	-3.84	***
"Characteristics of the Victim" Factor				
3. Only those who like to expose themselves by wearing revealing clothing will get raped.	6.12	6.51	-2.99	**
10. The reason that a rape happens is that the victim does not protest as she should.	5.90	6.26	-2.32	*
14. If a prostitute gets raped, it is not necessary to report it to the police.	5.76	6.21	-4.01	***
19. A good girl will never get raped.	6.52	6.75	-2.49	**
20. Rape victims also enjoy the sex when they are raped.	6.26	6.69	-3.75	***
Subscale Total	5.90	6.21	-2.81	**
"Blaming the Victim" Factor				
9. I can accept the idea of making friends with a rape victim.	5.65	6.07	-4.02	***
12. Rape victims do not know how to behave themselves properly.	5.59	6.22	-4.00	***
13. Many women would like to be raped, so they are always under attack.	6.04	6.57	-4.01	***
18. The reason that one may be raped is that she or he is not rational or cool enough to handle things.	5.67	6.14	-3.03	**
Subscale Total	5.75	6.25	-4.66	***
Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale	5.65	6.02	-4.55	***

*p<.05; **p<.01; and ***p<.001

Table 4 Attribution Factor: Characteristics of the Rape Victim*

Victim's characteristics	N	%
too trusting in people	132	49.6
exposes too much by wearing revealing clothing	67	25.2
too weak	55	20.7
frivolous, flippant, playful	36	13.5
easily can cause a man to have vicious ideas	34	12.8
does not protest or struggle to escape	30	11.3
does not behave herself	16	6.0
a "bad girl"	8	3.0
retribution (one inevitably reaps what he sows)	7	2.6

*Question: Considering the characteristics of the rape victim, which factor do you think is the major cause of rape? Choose as many as apply.

TABLE 5 . MEAN DIFFERENCE (t) TEST FOR GENDER'S ATTITUDES TOWARD RAPE VICTIMS, ATTRIBUTION OF CAUSALITY, BELIEF IN A JUST WORLD, AND OTHER VARIABLES

Scale and Subscale	Male		Female			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Just World Scale	3.92	.37	4.05	.38	-2.67	**
"Just" Factor	4.15	.86	4.21	.94	-.56	
"Unjust" Factor	4.15	.80	4.37	.75	- 2.25	*
Female Role Stereotype Scale	4.88	.75	5.16	.77	- 2.86	**
"Traditional Female Role" Factor	5.07	.81	5.39	.80	- 3.05	**
Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale	5.65	.68	6.02	.55	- 4.55	***
"Victimization" Factor	5.90	.97	6.21	.73	- 2.81	**
"Characteristics of the Victim" Factor	6.13	.79	6.50	.65	- 3.84	***
"Blaming the Victim" Factor	5.75	.89	6.26	.79	- 4.66	***
Attribution: Victim Characteristics	3.68	1.54	4.36	1.86	- 3.17	**
Attribution: Rapist Characteristics	1.94	1.30	2.18	1.63	- 1.32	
Attribution: Circumstances	2.59	1.40	2.78	1.61	- .96	
Attribution: The Luck Factor	3.94	1.68	4.31	1.75	- 1.70	

* p<.05, ** p<.01, and *** p<.001

TABLE 6. PEARSON CORRELATION MATRIX FOR SCALES AND SUBSCALES[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1.00	.58***	.58***						.10*			.13*	
2	.58***	1.00	.16**						.12*			.12*	
3	.58***	.16**	1.00					.15***					
4					.99***	.57***	.38***	.44***	.40***	.27***			
5				.99***	1.00	.57***	.40***	.45***	.40***	.29***			
6				.57***	.57***	1.00	.67***	.85***	.78***	.19**	-.29**		
7				.38***	.40***	.67***	1.00	.54***	.50***	.28***	-.11*		
8			.15**	.44***	.45***	.85***	.54***	1.00	.70***	.29***	-.18***		.14**
9	.10*	.12*		.40***	.40***	.78***	.50***	.70***	1.00	.33***	-.15**	.10*	.12**
10				.27***	.29***	.19***	.28***	.29***	.33***	1.00		.39**	
11						.29**	-.11*	-.18**	-.15**			.16**	
12	.13*	.12*							.10*	.39***	.16**	1.00	.11**
13								.14**	.12**			.11**	1.00

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.

a. 1=Just World Scale, 2="Just" Factor, 3="Unjust" Factor, 4= Sex Role Stereotype Scale, 5="Traditional Female Role" Factor, 6=Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale, 7="Victimization" Factor, 8="Characteristics of the Victim" Factor, 9="Blaming the Victim" Factor, 10=Attribution: Characteristics of the Victim, 11=Attribution: Characteristics of the Rapist, 12=Attribution: The Circumstances When the Rape Occurred, and 13=Attribution: The Luck Factor.

References

Abel, G.G., D.H. Barlow, E. Blanchard, and D. Guild. 1977. "The components of rapists' sexual arousal." Archives of General Psychiatry 34: 895-903.

Acock, Alan C. and Nancy K. Ireland. 1983. "Attribution of blame in rape cases: The impact of norm violation, gender, and sex-role attitudes." Sex Role 9: 179-193.

Atwood, R.W., and R.J. Howell. 1971. "Pupilometric and personality test score differences of female aggressing peduphiliacs and normals." Psychonumic Science 22: 115-116.

Brownmiller, S. 1975. Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Brozan, N. 1985. "Jurors in rape trials studied." New York Times (June 17): 20.

Burt, Martha R. 1980. "Cultural myths and supports for rape." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 38: 217-230.

Calhoun, L., J. Selby, and L. Warring. 1976. "Social perception of the victim's causal role in rape: An exploratory examination of four factors." Human Relations 26: 517-526.

Cann, A. et al.. 1981. "Rape: A contemporary overview and analysis." Journal of Social Issues 37: 1-4.

Chen, Jeaw-Mei and F.H. Tu. 1984. "Attitudes toward the handicapped." Chinese Sociological Journal 18: 91-112.

Chen, Jeaw-Mei and Phylis Lan Lin. 1987. "Gender differences in attitudes toward rape victims and beliefs in a just world - The case in Taiwan." Paper presented at the 1st International China Symposium, Indianapolis.

Chen, Ro-Chang. 1986. "In the shadow of the dark: Why did they rape me?" Living Psychology 97: 85-89 (in Taiwan).

Clark, L. and D. Lewis. 1977. Rape: The Price of Coercive Sexuality. Toronto: The Women's Press.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. 1986. Crime in the United States: Uniform Crime Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Field, H.S. 1978. "Attitudes toward rape: A comparative analysis of police, rapist, crisis counselors, and citizens." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 36: 156-179.

Gager, N. and C. Schurr. 1976. Sexual Assault: Confronting Rape in America. New York: Grosset and Dunlap.

Howard, Judith A. "Social influences on attribution: Blaming some victims more than others." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 47: 494-505.

Janoff-Bulmann, R. 1979. "Characterological versus behavioral self-blame: Inquiries into depression and rape." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37: 1798-1809.

Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983.

Johnson, Allan G. 1980. "On the prevalence of rape in the United States." Signs 6: 136-145.

Jones, C. and E. Aronson. 1973. "Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of respectability of the victim." Journal of Personality 26: 415-419.

Kilpatrick, D.K., L.J. Veronen, and C.L. Best. 1984. "Factors predicting psychological distress among rape victims." in Trauma and its Wake: The Study of Treatment of Postraumatic Stress Disorder, edited by C.R. Figley. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Kilpatrick, D.G. et al.. 1985. "Mental health correlates of criminal victimization: A random community survey." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 53: 866-873.

Koss, Mary P. 1985. "The hidden rape victim: Personality, attitudinal, and situational characteristics." Psychology of Women Quarterly 9: 193-212.

Koss, M.P., C. A. Gidycz, and N. Wisniewski. 1987. "The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 55: 162-170.

Krulewitz, J. and J. Nash. 1979. "Effects of rape victim resistance, assault outcome, and sex of observer on attribution about rape." Journal of Personality 47: 557-574.

Langer, E.J. 1975. "The illusion of control." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 32: 311-328.

L'Armond, K., A. Pepiton, and T.E. Shanmugam. 1981. "Attitudes toward rape: A comparison of the role of chastity in India and the United States." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 12: 284-303.

Lerner, M.J. 1965. "The effect of responsibility and choice on a partner's attractiveness following failure." Journal of Personality 33: 178-187.

Lerner, M.J. 1970. "The desire for justice and reaction to victims." in Altruism and Helping Behavior, edited by J. McCauley and L. Berkowitz. New York: Academic Press.

Lerner, M.J. 1980. The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion. New York: Plenum Books.

Ma, L.C. and K.B. Smith. 1985. "Individual and social correlation of the just world belief: A study of Taiwanese college students." 57: 35-38.

Malamuth, N.M. and J.V.P. Check. 1981. "The effects of mass media exposure on acceptance of violence against women: A fixed experiment." Journal of Research in

Personality 15: 436-446.

Malamuth, N.M. and E. Donnerstein. 1982. "The effects of aggressive-pornographic mass media stimuli." Pp. 103-136 in Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, edited by L. Berkowitz. New York: Academic Press.

Malamuth, N., S. Hager, and S. Feshback. 1980. "Testing hypotheses regarding rape: Exposure to sexual violence, sex, difference, and 'normality' of rapists." Journal of Research in Personality 14: 121-137.

Ratliff, K.G., Jeaw-Mei Chen, and Phylis Lan Lin. 1988. "Factors predicting college students' acceptance of disabled persons." Paper presented at the Southeastern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans.

Ratliff, K.G., Jeaw-Mei Chen, and Phylis Lan Lin. 1988. "A cross-cultural analysis of attitudes toward disabled persons." Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta.

Russell, D.E.H. 1982. Rape in Marriage. New York: Macmillan.

Ryan, W. 1971. Blaming the Victim. New York: Vintage.

Sanday, P.R. 1981. "The socio-cultural context of rape: A cross-cultural study." Journal of Social Issues 37: 5-27.

Sattem, L., J. Savells, and E. Murray. 1984. "Sex-role stereotypes and commitment of rape." Sex Role 11: 849-860.

Scully, D. and J. Marolla. 1982. "Convicted rapists' vocabulary of motive: Excuses and justifications." Social Problems 31: 530-544.

Scully, D. and J. Marolla. 1985. "'Riding the bull at Gilley's': Convicted rapists describe the rewards of rape." Social Problems 32: 251-263.

Seligmann, J. 1984. "The date who rapes." Newsweek (April 9): 91-92.

Spence, J.T. and R. Helmreich. 1972. "The attitudes toward women scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society." JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology 2: 66.

Thornton, B. "Defensive attribution of responsibility: Evidence for an arousal-based motivational bias." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 46: 721-734.

Warr, M. 1985. "Fear of rape among urban women." Social Problems 32: 238-250.

Williams, L.S. 1984. "The classic rape: When do victims report?" Social Problems 31: 459-467.

Williams, J.E. and K.A. Holmes. 1982. "The second assault: Rape and public attitudes." Sociology and Social Research 67: 101-102.

Wyer, R.S., G.V. Bodenhausen, and T.F. Gorman. 1985. "Cognitive mediators of reactions to rape." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 48: 324-338.